



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

↓ 0

TS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/048,026 03/26/98 UCHINO K 826.1482/JDH

□

LM02/0829

EXAMINER

PAULA, C

STAAS & HALSEY
700 ELEVENTH STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20001

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2776

7

DATE MAILED:

08/29/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/048,026

Applicant(s)

UCHINO ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2776

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☒ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 6/9/2000.

This action is made final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 8-9, 11, 16-19, and 30-31 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 19, and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numata, in view of Shima et al (Pat. # 5,835,922, 11/10/1998, filed on 9/29/1997) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numata in view of Shima et al as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Takano have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Priority

5. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # 09-242247 filed in Japan on 9/8/1997, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

6. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

7. The title of the invention has been modified to be more indicative of the claimed invention; therefore the objection to the title has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numata (Pat. # 5,943,669, 8/24/1999, filed on 11/21/1997) in view of Takano (Pat. # 5,940,831, 8/17/1999, filed on 8/22/1997).

Regarding independent claim 1, Numata discloses *a document group analysis device to classify a plurality of documents forming a set of documents into at least one group of cross-referenced documents*-- "...document is analyzed for its logical structure, the structural elements of the classification units are determined" (Col. 3, lines 52-67), "classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors" (Col. 6, lines 9-24), and "HTML documents are classified.....Classification units are made to be paragraphs....." (Col. 13, lines 33-67, and Col. 14, lines 1-14). Numata teaches a computer for classifying documents, such as HTML, by extracting, and analyzing classification units common among the documents—*cross references*--

and based on the similarity of these units generating classification groups of documents as shown in Fig. 14.

Moreover, Numata discloses *a document group keyword extraction device to extract a keyword contained in a document*-- “the four documents.....can be classified into two categories....based on the degree of joint-ownership of the keywords.....” (Col. 2, lines 6-19). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches classifying documents extracting keywords.

Furthermore, Numata discloses “document extraction selects an element from the categories that were classified with classification section 8, and displays it on the display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 26-37), and “...the document structure of the document is analyzed , and the title element ‘TITLE’....are identified and expressed as a tree arrangement....section 4.....extracts keywords..” (Col. 14, lines 2-28). Numata fails to explicitly disclose *a document group keyword device to display a title relevant to each group of documents* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this function, because Numata teaches selecting an “element” such as *title relevant to each group of documents* and displaying names of the document categories on the screen as seen in Fig. 14.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Numata discloses: *The apparatus wherein said document group keyword display device displays with enhancement a group of documents*.....-- “the four documents...can be classified into two categories” (Col. 2, lines 6-20). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the display of the classification of 4 documents as to set the classification groups apart-- *displays with enhancement a group of documents*.

Art Unit: 2776

Regarding independent claim 3, Numata discloses *a document group analysis device to classify a plurality of documents forming a set of documents into at least one group of cross-referenced documents*-- “...document is analyzed for its logical structure, the structural elements of the classification units are determined” (Col. 3, lines 52-67) , “classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors” (Col. 6, lines 9-24), and “HTML documents are classified.....Classification units are made to be paragraphs” (Col. 13, lines 33-67, and Col. 14, lines 1-14). Numata teaches a computer for classifying documents, such as HTML, by extracting, and analyzing classification units common among the documents—*cross references*-- and based on the similarity of these units generating classification groups of documents as shown in Fig. 14.

Moreover, Numata discloses “the four documents.....can be classified into two categories....based on the degree of joint-ownership of the keywords.....” (Col. 2, lines 6-19), and “classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors” (Col. 6, lines 9-24). Numata fails to explicitly disclose *a document attribute analysis device to extract document attribute information* However, Takano discloses “....one or more servers storing the node data and its link data.....node data obtained from the server” (Col. 2, lines 33-46). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status

Art Unit: 2776

of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Furthermore, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....displays it on display section” (Col. 6, lines 26-37, and Fig. 14). Numata fails to explicitly disclose *a document group structure display device to display cross-references in each group of documents* However, Takano discloses “a hypermedia system.....The location of these contents are uniquely determined by..... URL. The relation between nodes is described by tracking the URL.....” (Col. 1, lines 18-60, Fig. 6, and 11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Numata discloses “classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors” (Col. 6, lines 9-24). Numata fails to explicitly: *The apparatus....displays the cross-references in each group of documents in a tree structure* However, Takano discloses “A hypermedia system.....The location of these contents are uniquely determined by..... URL. The relation between nodes is described by tracking the URL.....” (Col. 1, lines 18-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by

recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Numata discloses: *The apparatus.....said document group structure display device further displays a plurality of topics.....* -- “FIG. 14 is a classification tale that illustrates the results which manually classify the documents in the experimental set.....” (Col. 15, lines 53-65). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the display of *a plurality of topics* of the classified documents.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Numata discloses: *The apparatus.....said document group structure display device displays each topic and a relevant node* -- “FIG. 14 is a classification tale that illustrates the results which manually classify the documents in the experimental set.....” (Col. 15, lines 53-65). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the display of *a plurality of topics* of the classified documents.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 3, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....displays it on display section” (Col. 6, lines 26-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.....said document group structure display device displays with enhancement a node corresponding to a document* However, Takano discloses “a hypermedia system.....The location of these contents are uniquely determined by..... URL. The relation between nodes is described by tracking the URL.....” (Col. 1, lines 18-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a

way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding independent claim 8, Numata discloses *a document group analysis device to classify a plurality of documents forming a set of documents into at least one group of cross-referenced documents*-- “...document is analyzed for its logical structure, the structural elements of the classification units are determined” (Col. 3, lines 52-67) , “classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors” (Col. 6, lines 9-24), and “HTML documents are classified....Classification units are made to be paragraphs” (Col. 13, lines 33-67, and Col. 14, lines 1-14). Numata teaches a computer for classifying documents, such as HTML, by extracting, and analyzing classification units common among the documents—*cross references*-- and based on the similarity of these units generating classification groups of documents as shown in Fig. 14.

Moreover, Numata discloses *a topic analysis device to further classify each of the classified group of documents based on topics extracted from each document*-- “Reclassification indication section 11 selects the categories which are to be reclassified.....” (Col. 6, lines 20-24). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the reclassification of documents according to their contents or *topics extracted from each document*.

Moreover, Numata discloses *a topic keyword extraction device*--“keywords are extracted....the heading vector generation section 5 extracts key words from the headings of all of the structural elements.....” (Col. 5, lines 57-67). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the extraction of key words for the classification of documents

Furthermore, Numata discloses *a topic keyword display device for displayinga relevant title and a keyword extracted--* “display section 10 displays the categories resulted from the classification.....” (Col. 6, lines 16-24). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the display of *topic keywords* from the document retrieval results.

Claims 9-11, 12, 13-18 are directed towards a relevant document display method for implementing the apparatus found in claim 1-3, 4-8, 1, and 3 respectively, and are, similarly rejected.

10. Claims 19, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numata, in view of Lemay et al “Creating Commercial Web pages” (1996), and further in view of Shima et al (Pat. # 5,835,922, 11/10/1998, filed on 9/29/1997).

Regarding independent claim 19, Numata discloses “HTML documents are classified.....Classification units are made to be paragraphs” (Col. 13, lines 33-67, and Col. 14, lines 1-14) Numata fails to explicitly disclose *displaying a group of documents containing cross-referenced message document....of a forum and a message board*

However, Lemay et al disclose “setting up a customer bulletin board, such as the one shown in Figure 9.5” (pg. 162, pgph. 4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Lemay et al, because Lemay et al teach “....bulletin board gives your customers a sense of empowerment” (pg. 162, pgph. 4).

Numata discloses “classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors” (Col. 6, lines 9-24). Numata fails to explicitly disclose *a contents estimation device for estimate*

contents.....patterns of opinion input by authors However, Shima et al disclose “.....the contents of the received document are arranged in an order in which the writer has written elements of the document” (Col. 1, lines 53-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Lemay et al, and Shima et al, because Numata teaches in the preceding quote the classification and indexing of topic extracted from documents such as those input by the authors disclosed by Shima et al-- patterns of opinion input by authors.

Moreover, Numata discloses a topic analysis device for further classifying each of the classified group of documents based on topics extracted from each document-- “reclassification indication section 11 selects the categories which are to be reclassified.....” (Col. 6, lines 20-24). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches a section for the reclassification of documents based on the contents or topics extracted from each document.

Moreover, Numata discloses an input device to input a retrieval request-- “some systems extract key words from documents and automatically perform the retrieval of documents. Using...the document and the query.....” (Col. 1, lines 20-24). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches the input of a query to generate the retrieval of documents.

Moreover, Numata discloses a retrieval engine device to retrieve a document in the document database-- “the document retrieval device comprisesa document extraction section.....” (Col. 5, lines 30-41). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches a retrieval device for retrieving documents from a database.

Furthermore, Numata discloses a view generation device to generate plurality of views.....-- “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were

classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37, and Fig. 14). In the preceding quote, Numata teaches a section to generate the display of document views.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “classification section 8 classifies the documents into one or more categories based on the degree of similarity among the composite vectors” (Col. 6, lines 9-24). Numata fails to explicitly disclose *said view generation device displays as a directed graph an author of each document* However, Shima et al disclose “.....the contents of the received document are arranged in an order in which the writer has written elements of the document” (Col. 1, lines 53-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Shima et al, because Numata teaches in the preceding quote the classification and indexing of topic extracted from documents such as those input by the authors disclosed by Shima et al-- *from an author’s viewpoint*.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “documents may be retrieved based on their degree of similarity to the query, indicative of the quality of the document search.” (Col. 3, lines 65-67). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus....document stored in the document database is a message.....* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, and Shima et al, because Numata teaches in the preceding quote the retrieval of documents such as *network news*.

Claim 30 is directed towards a method of displaying a relevant document for implementing the apparatus found in claim 19, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 31 is directed towards a computer-readable storage medium for storing the apparatus found in claim 19, and is similarly rejected.

11. Claims 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numata in view of Lemay et al, further in view of Shima et al as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Takano.

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose *The apparatus....view generation means allows a user to easily understand an entire structure of reference.....* However, Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations” (Col. 1, lines 51-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.... displays a reference tree structure of displayed documents.....* However, Takano discloses “.....FIG. 13.....Each of WWW servers.....stores several content files as nodes in hypertext” (Col. 1, lines 28-36). It would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 2776

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.... displays a reference tree structure of displayed documents.....* However, Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relation” (Col. 1, lines 51-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus....so that a user to easily understand an entire structure of reference.....* However, Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations” (Col. 1, lines

Art Unit: 2776

51-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 19, “documents may be retrieved based on their degree of similarity to the query, indicative of the quality of the document search.” (Col. 3, lines 65-67). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.....device displays in a calendar format....* It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Numata discloses in the preceding quote, the retrieval of documents based on the degree of similarity such as the similarity of a time frame.

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.....device displays, at a high intensity level, a specified topic pattern.....* However, Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relation” (Col. 1, lines 51-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing

the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “documents may be retrieved based on their degree of similarity to the query, indicative of the quality of the document search.” (Col. 3, lines 65-67). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.....retrieve only a document corresponding to a question and answer in a specified topic pattern.....* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Numata teaches in the preceding quote the retrieval of document through the means of a query—*question and answer*.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 19, Numata discloses “document extraction section 12 selects an element from the categories that were classified.....and displays it on display section.....” (Col. 6, lines 25-37). Numata fails to explicitly disclose: *The apparatus.... device displays a specified author at a high intensity level based on a history of input opinions....* However, Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relation” (Col. 1, lines 51-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata, Shima et al, and Takano, because Takano discloses “.....a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data” (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 6/9/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1-18, the Applicants state: "No explanation was provided in the Office Action regarding what in Numata would correspond to cross-references in documents..." (pg. 13, pgph. 4). As the Examiner explained in the previous office action, Numata teaches the classification of documents into groups (Col. 6, lines 9-24, and Fig. 14), and Takano teaches categorizing web pages (Col. 1, lines 18-60)—cross-referenced documents.

Moreover, the Applicants state: "... 'elements' in Numata are portions of a single document....does not contain any suggestion of displaying 'a title relevant to each group of documents' ..." (pg. 14, pgph. 3). Numata discloses that an element could be a title (Col. 14, lines 1-28, and Fig. 14 topic).

Moreover, the Applicants submit that neither Takano nor Numata teach: "... Displaying either cross-references or anything in a tree structure ..." (pg. 15, pgph. 1). Numata discloses that an element could be a title (Col. 14, lines 1-28, and Fig. 14 topic). Takano teaches the display of cross-referenced documents, and displaying documents in a tree structure in Fig. 11, and 13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the classification of documents such as HTML documents as taught by Numata and the display of cross-referenced documents in a tree structure as taught by Takano because Takano discloses ensuring more efficient navigation of documents (Col. 1, 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Further, regarding claim 8, the Applicants submit that: "... There is no suggestion in either Numata or Takano of extracting and displaying topic keywords" (pg. 15, pgph. 4).

However, as set forth in the office action, Numata discloses the extraction of keywords representative of classification units” topic keywords” for the classification of documents (Col. 5, lines 57-67), and displaying relevant topic keyword, and title (Col. 6, lines 16-24, and Fig. 14).

Moreover, regarding claims 19-31, the Applicants submit that: “.... Numata does not teach or suggest the contents estimation device.....” (pg. 16, pgph. 1). However, as set forth in the office action, Numata discloses the classifying or estimating the contents of documents (Col. 6, lines 9-24), such as documents arranged in the order written by the author patter of opinion as disclosed by Shima et al (Col. 1, 53-65).

Further, the Applicants submit that: “.... there is no index like that recited” (pg. 16, pgph. 2). However, as set forth in the office action, Numata discloses the display of several views of results from the retrieval, and indexing of classified documents (Col. 6, 25-37, and Fig. 14).

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2776

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. MOON et al. (Pat. # 6,088,696), BIRRELL et al. (Pat. # 6,029,164), BURROWS (Pat. # 6,021,409), TAYLOR (Pat. # 5,832,497), and LEVAC et al. (Pat. # 6,034,970).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


Art Unit: 2776

- (703) 308-5403, (for informal or draft communications for discussion only, please label **"PROPOSED"** or **"DRAFT"**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

cbp

08/23/00



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER